**Steamboat Companies—Interstate Commerce.**—The right of a state to require a steamboat company engaged in interstate commerce to maintain an agency and place of business within its limits as a condition of being permitted to touch at ports within the state, is denied in Ryman Steamboat Line Co. *v.* Com. (Ky.) 10 L. R. A. (N. S.) 1187.

---

**Contract or Combination to Lessen Competition.**—A contract by a merchant, in consideration of the gift of a small quantity of the commodity which he is engaged in selling, by the agent of the manufacturer whose produce he is handling, to countermand an order given a rival, and not to handle the latter's goods, is held, in Standard Oil Co. *v.* State (Tenn.) 10 L. R. A. (N. S.) 1015, to render the agent liable to punishment at common law and under a statute making illegal any contract or combination to lessen competition.

---

**Absence of Attorney from Court as Contempt.**—The St. Louis Court of Appeals in the case of In re Clark, 103 Southwestern Reporter 1105, holds that the absence of an attorney from the court in which he has business, and when he should be there to attend to it, and when his absence delays or impedes the court's business, constitutes a contempt of court. An attorney at law is an officer of the court, and it is as much incumbent on him to attend the sittings of the court when a case in which he is of counsel is on trial, and which trial cannot proceed in his absence, as it is for the sheriff or the clerk of the court to be present.

---

**Licensing Drummers Selling Intoxicating Liquors.**—The right of a state to impose a license tax on the business of selling intoxicating liquors within the state by traveling salesmen, who solicit orders for wholesale houses in their state, is upheld by the Uuited States Supreme Court, in Dalamater *v.* South Dakato, 27 Supreme Court Reporter, 447. The regulation by a state of the business carried on within its borders to solicit proposals to sell intoxicating liquors, even though such liquors are situated in other states, cannot be held to be repugnant to the commerce clause of the Constitution because directly or indirectly burdening the right to sell in the state—a right which by virtue of the Wilson Act does not exist.

---

**Relief From Void or Fraudulent Marriage.**—While a marriage contracted fraudulently or by deception as where one party to the contract impersonates another person, is void and constitutes no marriage in law, nevertheless in equity the chancellor will recognize certain rights which a person so defrauded may have in the premises and which are being violated or are in danger of being violated, as where the other party publishes the fact of the marriage and in other ways

annoys the party so deceived. Where such a right is proven and its violation proven, the chancellor is able to shape a decree which may be as effective a remedy as the particular case may demand.

We called attention to this extension of equity jurisdiction in our comments upon the great New Jersey case of Vanderbilt *v.* Mitchell, 65 Cent. L. J. 35. The same question was before the Supreme Court of New York (trial term) in the recent case of Randazzo *v.* Roppolo, 105 N. Y. Supp. 481, where the court held that where defendant went through the form of a marriage ceremony with a man impersonating plaintiff, plaintiff, though not entitled to an annulment of the certificate of marriage filed with the bureau of vital statistics, nor to an annulment of the marriage, was entitled to a judicial determination that he was not at the time and place stated in the certificate married to the defendant, and to an injunction restraining her from claiming to be his wife.—Cent. Law Journal.

---

**Interstate Commerce in Intoxicating Liquors.**—In Adams Express Company *v.* Commonwealth of Kentucky, 27 Supreme Court Reporter, 606, 206 U. S. 129, 51 L. Ed. 987, the United States Supreme Court takes the position that an agreement by a local agent of an express company to hold for a few days a C. O. D. interstate shipment of intoxicating liquors, to suit the convenience of the consignee in paying for such liquors, and taking it away, does not destroy the character of the transaction as interstate commerce, so as to render the express company amenable to prosecution for violating a state local option law. This decision is based on the recent case of Heyman *v.* Southern R. Co., 203 U. S. 270, 27 Supreme Court Reporter, 104, 51 L. Ed. 178, and by it the Supreme Court reverses the decision of the Kentucky Court of Appeals to the contrary in 27 Ky. Law Rep. 1096, 87 Southwestern Reporter, 1111.

---

**Turntables.**—The Supreme Court of Ohio in Wheeling and Lake Erie Railroad *v.* Hafvey, 83 N. E. 66 (Dec. 3rd, 1907), repudiated the doctrine of the Turntable Cases and followed the ruling of the Supreme Court of Virginia in Walker *v.* Potomac, etc., R. Co., 105 Va. 226, 53 S. E. 113, 4 L. R. A. (N. S.), 80, 115 Am. St. Rep. 71, 12 Va. Law Reg. 235.

---

**Use of Public Roads by Automobiles.**—The constitutionality of a law regulating the speed of automobiles on public roads, and requiring the licensing of such conveyances, was questioned in State *v.* Swagerty, 102 Southwestern Reporter, 483, on the ground that it was class legislation because applicable only to automobiles. The Missouri Supreme Court in deciding the case was, however, of the opinion that, as the law applies to and affects all parties of the same class, it is not vulnerable to the objection raised.